

The Sun

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1903.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.
 DAILY, Per Month, \$2.00
 DAILY, Per Year, \$20.00
 SUNDAY, Per Year, \$2.00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$22.00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month, \$1.90
 Postage to foreign countries added.
 THE SUN, New York City

PARIS—Kiosque No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and Kiosque No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines.
 If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication will have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Readers of THE SUN leaving the city can have the Daily and Sunday editions mailed to their addresses which may be changed when necessary for 75 cents a month. Order through your newsdealer or THE SUN, 170 Nassau street.

Vice-Presidential.

Our contemporary the *Chicago Post* discusses somewhat vaguely the limited functions of the Vice-President under the present system of administration, and then declares that a change is "eminently desirable, if not absolutely necessary." It remarks:

"The time has come to make a radical change in the position occupied by the Vice-President of the United States. The Constitution simply provides that the Vice-President shall preside over the Senate and succeed to the Presidency in certain contingencies. There it stops."

As far as we can make out our contemporary's notion of the change that is eminently desirable if not absolutely necessary in the case of the Vice-President, it is that he ought to have, first, a seat at Cabinet meetings and a share in Cabinet deliberations, and, secondly, a recognized place as the expounder and defender of Government policies before the people.

That is, the Vice-President should attend Cabinet meetings as regularly as any of the Cabinet officers; and he, rather than the President, should be the one to go forth and swing the circle and do the speechmaking.

If that is all, no amendment of the Constitution is required. No change whatever is needed in the duties. All that is necessary is that the Chief Executive shall invite the Vice-President to Cabinet meetings and shall send him forth to the country, from time to time, as the recognized spokesman of the Administration.

There is nothing in the Constitution or the laws to prevent the immediate accomplishment of this radical change in the position occupied by the Vice-President himself. It depends wholly upon the President. It could be done to-morrow, but for the circumstance that there is at this time no Vice-President to aggrandize.

King Edward and the Cabinet Crisis in Great Britain.

It is an extraordinary fact that so prolonged a delay should have been experienced in filling the vacancies in the Balfour Ministry caused by four resignations. Two of the offices vacated, those of Chancellor of the Exchequer and of Secretary for India, are of capital importance; and even the other two, to wit, the posts of Secretary for Scotland and of Financial Secretary to the Treasury, would normally be filled with promptitude.

Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that a cause for the delay should be sought, and we are disposed to credit the report which finds it in the position taken by King EDWARD VII., who is unwilling, it is said, to sanction any appointments which in his opinion are not calculated to promote the national welfare.

It is especially the War Office, we are told, which, in the inevitable readjustment of the Cabinet, he insists shall be given to a man qualified to devise and carry out a drastic reform of the British military system.

If it be true that this position has been taken by King EDWARD VII., it is not open to objection on the score of constitutionalism. It is true that the time has gone by in England when a statesman, clearly acceptable to a majority of the House of Commons, could be kept out of power through a sovereign's personal dislike. That could be done, and was done, by GEORGE III., and Queen VICTORIA, as the winter of 1851-52 and Queen VICTORIA practically caused the dismissal of Lord PALMERSTON from the Foreign Office, because his precipitate recognition of LOUIS NAPOLEON after the *coup d'état* of Dec. 2, 1851, was extremely distasteful to Prince ALBERT and herself. It is well known, also, that Queen VICTORIA, in 1880, when Lord BEACONSFIELD resigned the Premiership, sent for Lord HARTINGTON, instead of Mr. GLADSTONE, and was disappointed when informed that only the last named statesman could form a Government. That a Premier known to be backed by a working majority of the House of Commons must be permitted to choose his colleagues is a principle that has been invariably recognized since, in 1833, Lord ABERDEEN informed Queen VICTORIA that he could not undertake to form a Government without Lord PALMERSTON's assistance. We have no doubt that the principle would be accepted by King EDWARD VII. if a case were now presented for its application.

As a matter of fact, King EDWARD does not know and Mr. BALFOUR has no right to assert that at the existing juncture he possesses the confidence of the House of Commons. The Cabinet crisis has occurred during a recess of Parliament; and it remains to be seen whether, in view of the defection of the Unionist Free Traders, he can muster a majority, even with the support of Irish Nationalist votes. Unquestionably, the compact, homogeneous majority which he had at his back a few months ago has been irreparably lost. It is, therefore, obvious that he is in an anomalous situation and can no longer speak with the authority which was his before the Unionist party resigned and called upon the Duke of DEVONSHIRE to form a Cabinet tainted by

predilections for a preferential or for a retaliatory tariff.

We presume that Mr. BALFOUR's prestige in the eyes of his sovereign and his influence over the waverers in the Unionist ranks have been slightly increased by the circumstance that the seat vacated by Lord CHANBORNE, on his accession to the Marquisate of SALISBURY, has been gained by the Unionist candidate with a majority somewhat larger than that with which it was secured on the last occasion when it was contested. Closely scrutinized, however, this latest by-election scarcely warrants the construction put upon it by the friends of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN and Mr. BALFOUR. The successful candidate, a large employer of labor, is locally popular, and, moreover, he has publicly declared that he would never favor any policy the effect of which would be to increase the price of food. His election, therefore, cannot be counted as a triumph for a preferential tariff, which, as every fair minded person admits, would add to the cost of a loaf of bread.

Practically, therefore, the outcome of this local contest leaves Mr. BALFOUR where he was before, namely, in the position of a Premier who has not yet proved that he possesses the confidence of the House of Commons. He cannot, therefore, reasonably object when the sovereign indicates a wish to share with him the responsibility for a right conduct of public affairs during the recess of Parliament.

Mr. Murphy's Mathematics.

By the aid of district leaders, special inspectors and judicious conditor calculators like the Hon. THOMAS F. GRADY, the Hon. CHARLES F. MURPHY had a "thorough canvass" made of Manhattan and The Bronx. He has sought exact and conservative estimates; bed-rock figures and no rainbows. If the reports of the reports of his census bureau can be trusted, he is sure of carrying Manhattan and The Bronx for McCLELLAN by 60,000 votes.

Now, ordinarily, Tammany knows some time before an election about how many votes it can depend on. Each district leader has to know his district. Usually Tammany's private information is pretty exact. There are exceptions, however. The extent of the disaster of 1902 was not foreseen.

At this stage of the game any estimates are premature and futile. Presumably the publication of Mr. MURPHY's census is intended as a warning to the Hon. HUGH McLAUGHLIN.

In 1901 the Low vote in Manhattan and The Bronx was 102,292; the Shepard vote 156,623. Tammany's plurality, even in the reaction of 1897, was only some 10,000. In that year the combined vote for Low and Tracy was 133,044, and the vote for VAN WYCK only 143,066. What has happened that is likely to bring Tammany from a minority party in Manhattan and The Bronx in 1901 to a party with a plurality of 60,000 in 1903?

In 1901 there was considerable feeling against Mr. CROKER as an "absentee." That cause of irritation in Tammany has been removed. Various liquor dealers revolted from Tammany and are now revolting against Low. In the view of some fusionists, the Low administration has not lived up to the perhaps too high hopes with which it was put into power; and any administration is sure to make enemies.

Do the return of backsliding Tammanyites and the protest of disgruntled fusionists amount to 30,000 votes? It would take that number of changes from the respective votes of Low and SHEPARD in Manhattan and The Bronx in 1901 to make Mr. MURPHY's 60,000. And while, even now, he can estimate the regular Tammany vote pretty accurately, he has small means of finding out what the independent Democratic vote, by which Fusion must stand or fall, will amount to.

Certain departments, such as Health and Street Cleaning, may have made the administration friends enough to make good its losses elsewhere. In any event, until the registration is completed neither Mr. MURPHY's political mathematics nor those of anybody else will be anything more than a diversion.

Germany in the Eastern Question.

The question of Germany in the near Eastern question has always been more or less mysterious, and frequently contradictory. In the earlier period, when Prussia stood as the exponent of German policy, that Government rendered important services to Russia.

During the war of 1829 between Russia and Turkey, the Russian army was so pressed by the Turks and wasted by disease that it became a question whether it would have to retreat and abandon the campaign entirely. The Emperor NICOLAS I. went on a visit to Berlin in connection with his approaching marriage to the sister of the King of Prussia. As a result of a conference between the two sovereigns on the situation in Turkey, couriers were hurried to the headquarters of the Russian army on the Danube and to the Prussian Ambassador at Constantinople. To the former they were ordered to concentrate the whole of the Russian forces and advance by rapid marches toward the Turkish capital; to the latter, instructions to impress upon the Porte, as soon as the Russian army was nearing Constantinople, the necessity of coming to terms with Russia without delay.

The programme laid down at Berlin was carried out to the letter. DIEBITSCH, who commanded the Russian army, had the celebrated march across the Balkans that earned for him the title of "BAL-KANSKY," and on his arrival at Adrianople he was met by Turkish commissioners, who signed the treaty of that name yielding to Russia all her demands. The British Government, when it became aware later of the circumstances, was furious and recalled its Ambassador at Constantinople. It is interesting to note that it was during this war that Capt. VON MOLKE, as Prussian military attaché with the Turkish army on the Danube, first exhibited the talent for military organization that welded the German army into the instrument of conquest it afterward became.

During the Crimean war of 1853-56 Prussia remained neutral and played a relatively small part in the conclusion of peace. Austria was then the leading power in the German confederation. The Six Weeks' war of 1866, however, and that with France in 1870, entirely altered conditions, and Germany practically became the arbiter of the situation. The Dreikaiserbund was formed, and in 1874 at Rastadt the partition of Turkey was arranged.

But the military power of Russia proved unequal to the carrying out of the programme in its integrity, and gave Germany, while posing in the Berlin Congress as a friend of Russia, the opportunity to take Turkey under her tutelage and advance her own interests. Gen. Baron COLMAR VON DER GOLTZ, one of the ablest of the German General Staff, was sent to Constantinople to train officers for the Turkish army; and the construction of the Anatolian railways has given Germany an economic and commercial interest in the maintenance of the Turkish power.

Toward the petty kingdoms and principalities that have been created by the shrinkage of Turkey in Europe Germany has always exhibited contempt. When Prince ALEXANDER BATTENBERG presented himself at Berlin to pay his respects on his election as Prince of Bulgaria, Prince BISMARCK lightly expressed the hope that his journey at Sofia would leave pleasing recollections. As to the present incumbent at Sofia, the Foreign Office in the Wilhelmstrasse declared its indifference as to whether the Prince of Bulgaria was named FERDINAND or CHRISTOPHER, but wanted the principality ruled by a STAMBOLOFF.

In Roumania alone has Germany shown any special interest, but that is connected with another question. During his stay in Vienna the Emperor WILLIAM no doubt explained his views to his imperial Austrian host. Any definite agreement as to the future of all the Balkan country will, to all appearances, be stamped with a strong German impression.

The New and the Old Theology.

A succinct definition of the basis of the "old theology" was given last Sunday by Dr. PATTON, the president of the Princeton Theological Seminary, when he said that "Christianity is a piece of information given supernaturally and miraculously."

A definition of the "new theology," now so fashionable, is presented in the last number of the *Outlook* by Prof. GEORGE FORT MOORE of the Harvard Divinity School, to this effect:

"The philosophy which underlies and pervades the traditional dogmatics is obsolete; the universe, as science reveals it, cannot be construed on its premises or in its terms. The conception of Scripture and the method of interpreting it by which theology was harmonized with philosophy and the specifically Christian dogmas were derived or proved is also obsolete. But the facts of Christian experience and religious history remain; the Christ of the Gospels remains; and these facts are no less intelligible or significant in our way of thinking than they were to the Greek fathers in theirs."

"The task of the constructive theologian to-day is to put in the place of the old dogmatics and apologetics a philosophy of the Christian religion in which the facts of Scripture, history and Christian experience are interpreted in conformity with modern conceptions of the universe and God's relation to it and of the nature and destiny of man."

Prof. MOORE, we believe, is from the Congregational and Andover Theological Seminary, and therefore his definition may be said to apply to the more fashionable school of theology of those descendants of the Puritans who did not join the revolt of Dr. CHANNING, though they now go further than he did, in their substantial rejection of the supernatural and miraculous element in Christianity.

Still another definition of the "new theology" is furnished by the Rev. E. P. HURLEY in the *Church Eclectic*, a representative of the "Catholic" party of the Episcopal Church. It is:

"That Anglicanism, like all otherisms, is a huge self-conceit—that the one certainty is the uncertainty of all human opinions, and that the Prayer Book is, from cover to cover, nothing more nor less than a bundle of human opinions. They seem to take as their motto in judging of the truth of doctrine 'HUMAN ASSURANCE,' that 'all our knowledge resolves itself into probability.' Like DISSENTERS, they think they can more safely reach the summits of faith by doubting everything. The one thing they are sure of is that others know nothing, and they are not quite certain about the contents of their own minds. These gentlemen would give us a new religion without a hypothesis—a mutilated GOSPEL as well as a mutilated Gospel. They would have us lay our faith to the ever changing hypothesis lately elaborated by those humorously styled 'advanced thinkers.'"

The "hypothesis" referred to, we may explain, is a term of theology which recalls bitter dissensions in the early Christian Church. It refers to the dogma of CHRIST as an essential person of the Trinity. Mr. HURLEY, therefore, may be put in the same theological category to which Dr. PATTON's definition of Christianity as miraculous information assigns the Princeton president.

Mr. HURLEY's paper, however, is rather an assertion that Anglicanism has inherited Catholic sacerdotal authority than an attempt to define Christianity. It is written, more particularly, for the purpose of denouncing a majority of the Anglican Bishops as heretical in rejecting that theory; and, unquestionably, fifty years ago the English prelates were unanimously opposed to the Oxford Movement; and only a few months ago the Bishop of DUREM wrote of the episcopal office that no one can "prove to us that the Church of CHRIST stands or falls with it." The Rev. Dr. RASHDALL, a fellow of Oxford, has also expressed the same view still more recently. He describes the "Apostolic succession" as a "gigantic argument" and says that he knows of clergymen who "even make a clean sweep of the miraculous, yet seem to cling to the doctrine of the Apostolic succession."

Mr. HURLEY's paper, in spite of its title, cannot be called a description of the "new theology," for the episcopal opinion he assails goes back to the very foundation of the Anglican Church, when CRANMER said, "the King might, in virtue of authority derived from God, make a priest, and the priest so made needed no ordination whatever."

We refer to Mr. HURLEY's argument only because it presents the view, technical, we might call it, as compared with Dr. PATTON's, that Christianity is a visible Church, with a sacerdotal priesthood, and that the Anglican inheritance of a historical inheritance from the Apostles, and that the Anglican is such a Church. He does not touch the main question as presented by Dr. PATTON. The Harvard theologian professes, however, to take issue with the Princeton theologian squarely, in rejecting the supernatural and miraculous element in Christianity. He contends and teaches that the facts of history are to be interpreted "in conformity with modern conceptions of the universe and God's relation to it;" with "the universe as science reveals it." Of course, there can be no such harmony with science unless the miraculous element in Christianity is removed and only a moral philosophy is left.

Such is the "new theology," as it calls itself; but how can it be a theology without miracle and supernaturalism? If it requires that Christianity shall be "in conformity" with natural science, or with the limitations of finite knowledge, it is not a religion at all. Practically, Prof. MOORE is an agnostic. He does not take Christianity on faith, but requires that it shall be submitted to scientific demonstration; yet, as Dr. PATTON said, Christianity has no basis as a religion except that it is "a piece of information given supernaturally and miraculously," far beyond the possible sphere of science. The "new theology" is not of the Christian religion. It belongs in the sphere of religious infidelity.

Envy and Military Genius.

We see and abhor in this letter the civilian's envy of military genius and glory:

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: I have read a great deal about the Aeneas of Boston, and every time the organization was mentioned I was in connection with feeling and doing, and their prowess in this respect seems entirely to overshadow any feat of martial valor that they may ever have accomplished."

"There's another outfit that seems to resemble the Aeneas, the Putnam Phalanx."

"Have these organizations any military value; that is to say, would they, in time of war, take the field and become a part of the United States Army?"

"New York, Sept. 24. MILITARIAN."

"Militarian" cannot hide his bile under that respectable name on a pretence of asking for information. He might just as well ask if NAPOLEON or GRANT ever had any military experience.

The Putnam Phalanx is esteemed in all military circles for its feats. For years it has devoted itself to the cultivation of these pillars of war. What and where is an army without legs? The marching, counter-marching, military bases and war footing of every army of every nation in the world owe much to the stately shins and noble phalanges of the Putnam Phalanx.

It is not true that every time the Ancients are mentioned "it is in connection with feasting and drinking." They invented the latter exercise and have notably developed the former, but their military service of other kinds has been great and varied. In 1890 they captured England and took the Bastille. In 1901 they fell on the Heights of Abraham. They are the only company in the world that the corporation of Cork fears.

In case of war would the Ancients take the field and become a part of the United States Army? They would not take the field. They would be detailed on commissary duty. The United States Army exists by the side of, but not in competition with, them. They are too high for rivalry. The Putnam Phalanx does not resemble them. None but themselves can be their parallel.

Major VON HAMBURG of the Prussian Army in his "Armies of the World" (Vol. V, page 411) says, in part, of the Ancients:

"In heavy automobile charges and hansom work, the construction of spouton bridges, capacity to endure a continuous row of high projects (highballs) and ability to go without water for long periods, this corps equals the best European troops. It constitutes the Old Reserve. Special, Vatted."

Major VON HAMBURG's rank as a military critic is of the highest.

The American Thirst.

In looking over our national bill for that which cheers and sometimes infuriates, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, we find that the people of the United States consumed 1,539,081,991 gallons of wines, malt liquors and distilled spirits, or an average of about 19 gallons for each man, woman and child in the country. The presentation of the figures in that form makes it quite evident that some must have had more than their share.

The question of particular interest is whether the habit is growing on us. Our use of wine shows a considerable variation from year to year. During the last generation it has fluctuated from a per capita consumption of 26 of a gallon, in 1896, to 63 of a gallon, in 1902. In 1888, it was 61. Taking the per capita consumption by periods of ten years, ending with the year stated, the annual average quantity in fractions of a gallon appears as follows:

1880	26
1890	49
1900	63

This shows no steady increase in the per capita consumption of wines, notwithstanding the fact that 1902 shows a greater consumption than any preceding year. It is probable that the excess of that year is to be accounted for by an increased use by a comparatively limited class to which money had come freely from business prosperity, rather than by any increase in general use by the entire community.

The year 1902 was also marked by an unusual consumption of distilled spirits, although the per capita consumption of that year was exceeded during each year from 1869 to 1875, both inclusive, and by the years 1881 to 1884, both inclusive, and the years 1890 to 1893, also inclusive. Marked fluctuation appears also in the use of spirits, as in the response in increase or decrease appears between the two. An idea of this variation in per capita annual consumption is indicated by the following

table, the quantity being shown in gallons and decimals thereof:

1860	2.62	1884	1.48
1865	2.81	1889	1.21
1870	2.86	1894	1.52
1875	2.90	1899	1.61
1880	2.97	1900	1.17
1885	3.06	1902	1.80

Taken by decades, the average annual consumption of distilled spirits, per capita, appears as follows:

Decade ending	Gallons
1860	1.90
1870	1.84
1880	1.25

Comparing these averages with the individual years 1840, 1850, 1860 and 1870, it would appear that we, as a people, are less given to the use of intoxicating liquor than were those of the generations preceding us.

A different condition is shown in the tables of consumption of malt liquors, beer, ale, etc. With only one or two breaks, beverages of this class show a constantly increasing use from year to year for the last forty years. The total consumption has increased from 62,372,465 gallons in 1863, to 1,381,875,437 gallons in 1902. In point of quantity, malt liquors constitute 93 per cent. of our annual consumption of wines and liquors. The per capita consumption of these has increased from 1.87 gallons in 1863 to 17.49 gallons in 1902. While there is no doubt that the use of beer and ale has greatly increased among those who may be classed as distinctly American, there can be no question that the very marked increase is to be attributed to the immigration of the many thousands of Germans and others who brought with them the habit and the custom of beer drinking. The last thirty years have brought us 2,500,000 immigrants from Germany alone, and that number of Germans can account for a very considerable beer consumption.

The managers of the anti-Tammany campaign will make a blunder if they open their canvass with a meeting in a Republican section of the city, as they intend to do at present. The earliest and smartest speeches should be delivered in downtown Manhattan districts, where the votes must be made that are in favor of victory.

This misstatement of a plain fact of law is becoming frequent in newspapers which demand an immediate return to the Nicaragua route for an inter-oceanic canal.

"The Spooner law directs the President to negotiate a treaty with Nicaragua and Costa Rica under a special commission. The law of Colombia to ratify the Hay-Herran treaty. That treaty has been rejected, and it is therefore Mr. Roosevelt's plan duty to proceed according to the provisions of the law."

There is no such specified condition in the Spooner law. The Hay-Herran treaty or its ratification or failure is not mentioned in the act. The President is directed to turn to Nicaragua only when necessary to obtain from Colombia the necessary rights "within a reasonable time and upon reasonable terms," and of the reasonableness of the time and the reasonableness of the terms the President is left by the law the sole judge.

Roman Catholic and Anglican and Greek Churches.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Your interesting account last Monday of the ritualism at the Danish Chapel in Brooklyn says truly that the Roman Catholic Church denies the validity of Anglican orders, but the statement that she also refuses to recognize those of the Greek Church is far from the truth.

An Anglican clergyman is received into the Catholic Church as a layman simply, but a Greek priest who becomes a Catholic would be regarded as a priest and permitted to offer the sacrifice of the mass and to perform the other functions of the ministry.

It would be a pity to avoid coordinating the numbers of Anglican clergymen who come to her if she regarded them as already Roman Catholics, but after a careful examination she has rejected their claims wholly, while recognizing the validity of the orders of the Russian, Russian, Greeks, Copts and other sects who are in schism against the authority of the Holy See.

Your account infers that the Greek Church, in recent years, has recognized the priesthood of the Anglican and Episcopal Churches in England and this country, because of the fact that Russian or Greek priests have been received into the Anglican and Episcopal Churches. But these are acts of individuals only and do not bind the churches, which, up to the present time, have refused to recognize Anglican orders. Bishop Brooks and the Russian Church have attended (Unitarian) services. I know an Episcopal clergyman who has often taken part in the services of the Russian Church. Such instances could be multiplied, but one who drew the inference that the Episcopal Church recognized the orders of these other Churches would be mistaken.

It is announced that Bishop Grafton has gone to St. Petersburg to endeavor to obtain a recognition of the Anglican claims on the part of the Russian Church. He will doubtless be treated politely, on the ground of common opposition to Rome, but the over-valuation of the Russian Church is not likely to secure any official acknowledgment of the validity of his orders. A few years ago the Russian Emperor Nicholas II. approached the Jesuitism of Holland and offered of intercommunion, but they were rejected by the Jesuits. Archbishop Ugrashevitch. This was before Rome had made her pronouncement in the matter. ALBERT LOCKE.

HACKENSACK, Sept. 24.

The Workman's Paper Cap.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Your correspondent "Engineer" in to-day's SUN falls foul because the illustrated papers, in cartoons of the workman "invariably picture him with a square paper cap on his head," and asks why this is done, as the original is "unheard of."

He is not well informed, because he limits his knowledge to his own observations. Twenty years ago the universal headgear of an inside workman while engaged in his shop, I have seen thousands of them. My own father, an employer of many men, used to work with them. They were cool and comfortable, and it was considered a badge of respect to be pictured with one. I have before me one of his old business cards on which is a picture of the inside of his shop, where the workmen appear with such caps on their heads. W. F. ORANON, N. J., Sept. 26.

Dr. Patton's Definition of Christianity.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: The comments in THE SUN to-day on Dr. Patton's Princeton sermon were timely and most admirable. Mistakenly that "Christianity is a piece of information given supernaturally and miraculously," sounds a note of awakening long waited for by many anxious hearts with whom religion is a subject of the deepest interest.

Who has ever heretofore stated the case so conclusively, covering the physical and metaphysical conditions involved in the Scriptural accounts, and spiritual phenomena, as Dr. Patton's words should go directly to the heart of every intelligent believer, full of comforting assurances, for they contain the gist of it all, beyond a doubt. NEW YORK, Sept. 25. HURUS R. MOORE.

The Censored Hand Organs of Boston.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: B. H. N. in writing to you of the "discordant hand organ," should not blame the Italian grinder, but should remember that every nation has the government it deserves.

IS HUNGARY IN PERIL?

The Relation of the Magyar Question to the Troubles Further South.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: The active interest shown of late by the Emperor William in Hungary and Hungarian affairs gave rise to the suspicion in that country that it was not wholly disinterested. His attitude has caused considerable disquietude at Vienna and St. Petersburg.

The German movement in Austria sensibly weakened the Triple Alliance by its action on the Slavonic population of Austria and the Italians of the Trentino. It also gave the Magyars of Hungary what they thought was their opportunity to fix their domination more firmly on the divided nationalities that form the majority of the population of that country. Hence the confusion now prevailing in the relations between the two parts of the dual monarchy having the Emperor Francis Joseph for their common sovereign. Hence also, in all probability, the underlying cause of the persistence of the moving spirits in the revolutionary movement in the Balkans in carrying on their work in spite of the threats and warnings of Russia and Austria and other European Governments.

It does not appear that any of the parties to the disturbance in either Hungary or the Balkans contemplated at any time the possibility of an active German intervention in their affairs. They will therefore be all the more and disagreeably surprised at the discovery that the Emperor William has already planned to take a very active part in settling the more vexed questions at this moment agitating the Danube and the Balkan regions. It will be no advantage for the Magyars of Hungary to have fought against the German language in the army to find the German soldier perhaps occupying garisons in their country; but they will render the possibility of it a certainty if they continue to insist on demands that render them as obnoxious to the rest of the population of Hungary as they are subservive of Hungarian independence in the end.

How absurd the Magyar pretensions to force their language upon the Hungarian Army are shown by the fact that out of the forty-seven regiments of the Hungarian Army only four are wholly composed of Magyars; only three contain 90 per cent.; and six have 80 per cent. Three other regiments contain less than 10, and five less than 20 per cent. of Magyars. Six others and the Croatian regiments contain no Magyars at all, while the remaining ones are composed almost entirely of Slovaks, Rumanians, Ruthenians and Serbs, with various proportions according to locality, the Magyars being in a more or less insignificant minority.

If anything can bring the Magyars to reason it should be the announcement that German troops may be sent to keep them in order while the Austrians descend into the Balkans to put down the disturbances there. Such a movement could only end in the ultimate loss of the independence of all the States east of the Bosphorus and the Black Sea, and the English and give a turn to the near Eastern question, contrary to the interests of more than one of the Western Powers, to say nothing of Russia.

NEW YORK, Sept. 26.

What the "Jewish Problem" Is.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: I make no pretensions to be as learned in the history of my people as Dr. Isidor Singer, but I agree with "Cosmopolitan" that he did not answer "Why a Jewish Problem?"

As an American Jew with a love for my country as well as for my race, I feel that there is a "Jewish Problem."

For centuries, throughout the countries of the earth where the Jewish population exists, the Jew has been denationalized. To-day human beings are being slaughtered because they profess the religion of Moses. What do we do to remedy this state of affairs is the "problem." There are three solutions:

First—The liberalizing of the nations in which the Jew is persecuted. Experience has shown that this is hopeless.

Second—The emigration of the Jew from the countries in which he is persecuted to newer and freer lands. This is the only practical solution.

Third—The founding of a Jewish State. As yet a dream.

It is a fair presumption that Dr. Singer and Max Nordau have expounded the case of "Zionism" because they believe the third proposal to be the correct solution. The carrying out of the second proposal makes our "Jewish problem" here, and nowhere else, the problem of the day in New York. Hundreds of thousands of these persecuted people are becoming American citizens. The solution of the problem is to make them fit for their new duties, and the responsibility for that solution rests with their American colonizers.

NEW YORK, Sept. 24. CHARLES H. ISANIAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir:

The assumption that a "Jewish problem" is without basis of fact is a serious error. The Jews are not a sect, but an exclusive people and will remain as we are, the "chosen people." Why do we not assimilate fully with gentiles? Because we do not choose to do so. We are a people with our own beliefs and our own traditions, and we are not willing to give up our own beliefs and traditions for the sake of becoming a part of the mass.

TO THE